



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/572,557

03/17/2006

Kaname Kawasaki

287593US0PCT

5072

22850

7590

06/15/2007

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

1940 DUKE STREET

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

WEDDINGTON, KEVIN E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1614

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/15/2007

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

kgardner@oblon.com

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/572,557

**Applicant(s)**

KAWASUGI, KANAME

**Examiner**

Kevin E. Weddington

**Art Unit**

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3-17-06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Claims 9-16 are presented for examination.

Applicant's preliminary amendment and information disclosure statement filed March 17, 2006 have been received and entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This is a written description rejection.

Claims 9-16 described compounds that are insulin resistance-improving drugs. The instant claims cover all compounds having the pharmaceutical property of being an insulin resistance-improving drug to treat diabetes. Describing a compound by its functions will not substitute for written description of the structure of the compound. The invention should be described in such a way as to described what the invention is, not what the invention does. Describing the function of a compound fails to distinguish the compound from other molecules or agents that can perform the same functions.

Art Unit: 1614

Undue experimentation is a conclusion reaches by weighing the noted factual considerations set forth below as seen in *In re Wands*, 858 F. 2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1401 (Fed. Cir. 1988). A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding a fair evaluation of an appropriate combination of the factors below, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

The factors include:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided
- 3) the presence or absence of working examples
- 4) the nature of the invention
- 5) the state of the art
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art and
- 8) the breadth of the claims

The instant specification fails to provide guidance that would allow the skilled artisan background sufficient to practice that instant invention without resorting to undue experimentation in view of further discussion below.

The nature of the invention, state of the prior art, relative skill of those in the art and the predictability of the art

Art Unit: 1614

Claims 9-16 are directed to compounds that are insulin resistance-improving drugs that are used to treat diabetes. The instant claims cover all compounds having pharmaceutical property of being known as a compound (insulin resistance-improving drugs) to treat diabetes. Although claims 11-15 lists specific examples of compounds which are alleged to have the property to treat diabetes, and claims 9 and 10 are directed to a variety of compounds with the functional description of being known as a compound which is alleged to have the property to treat diabetes.

The instant claims are very broad. For instance, claims 9 and 10 are to a plethora of compounds of as described by the functional properties as being known to treat diabetes.

The relative skill of those in the art is generally that of a Ph.D. or M.D.

One skilled in the art would not predict from the instant disclosure which compounds would fall under the umbrella of functional description of being known as broadly as an insulin resistance-improving drug. In fact, the courts have made a distinction between mechanical elements function the same in different circumstances, yielding predictable results, chemical and biological compounds often react unpredictably under different circumstances.

The breadth of the claims

The claims are very broad and inclusive to all insulin resistance-improving drugs that are used to treat diabetes.

The amount of direction or guidance provided and the presence or absence of working examples

The working examples only show pioglitazone as the insulin resistance-improving drug.

The quantity of experimentation necessary

Applicants have failed to provide guidance as to how the skilled artisan would be able to extrapolate from the disclosure and examples provided to make and possibly use the claimed invention. The amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to the degree of predictability in the art. Thus, although a single embodiment may provide broad enablement in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements, in cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, more teaching or guidance is required. (In re Fischer, 427 F. 2d 839, 166 USPQ 24; Ex Parte Hitzeman, 9 USPQ 2d 1823).

The quantity of experimentation needed to be performed by one skilled in the art is yet another factor involved in the determining whether “undue experimentation” is required to make and use the instant invention. The test is not merely quantitative, since a considerable amount of experimentation is permissible, if its is merely routine, or of the specification in question provides a reasonable amount of guidance with respect to the direction in which the experimentation should proceed. For these reasons, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue “painstaking experimentation study” to determine all the compounds or agents that are broadly known to possess the property of treating diabetes as described in this specification. In view of the information set forth supra, the instant disclosure is

Art Unit: 1614

not seen to be sufficient to describe the use of any compound , which is regarded as the functional description of a compound (insulin resistance-improving drug) for treating diabetes.

Therefore, undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as it is claimed in its current scope.

Claims 9-16 are not allowed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating or inhibiting a side effect selected from edema, heart enlargement and anemia in a subject with a composition comprising insulin resistance-improving drugs and vitamin B<sub>1</sub> or derivative thereof, does not reasonably provide enablement for prevention of a side effect from edema, heart enlargement and anemia with the said medicinal composition. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In this regard, the application disclosure and claims have been compared per factors indicated in the decision In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988) as to undue experimentation.

Art Unit: 1614

The factors include:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided
- 3) the presence or absence of working examples
- 4) the nature of the invention
- 5) the state of the art
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art and
- 8) the breadth of the claims

The instant specification fails to provide guidance that would allow the skilled artisan background sufficient to practice that instant invention without resorting to undue experimentation in view of further discussion below.

The nature of the invention, state of the prior art, relative skill of those in the art and the predictability of the art

The claimed invention relates to a method for the prevention of side effects selected from edema, heart enlargement and anemia in a subject, comprising administering a medicinal composition comprising said compound to said subject.

The relative skill of those in the art is generally that of a Ph.D. or M.D.

There are no known preventive therapies for side effects such as edema, heart enlargement and anemia in the art.



Art Unit: 1614

It is clear the art to which the present invention relates is highly unpredictable and unreliable with respect to conclusions drawn from laboratory data extrapolated to clinical efficacy.

The breadth of the claims

The claims are very broad and inclusive of any "causes" of a side effect selected from edema, heart enlargement and anemia.

The amount of direction or guidance provided and the presence or absence of working examples

There are no examples showing the instant composition will, in fact, prevent a side effect selected from edema, heart enlargement and anemia in a subject not presently at risk of or predisposed to developing such a side effect. No examples showing the instant composition is administered to a healthy subject not having a side effect, and the administration of the instant composition will prevent the subject from having a side effect from the administration of the instant composition during his or her lifetime. Current modes of treatment are known, but there are no known agents, which can be, prevent the causes of a side effect such as edema, heart enlargement and anemia in a healthy subject.

The quantity of experimentation necessary

Applicants have failed to provide guidance as to which cause would be prevented for a side effect selected from edema, heart enlargement and anemia. The skilled artisan would expect the interaction of a particular drug in the prevention of causes of a side effect to be very specific and highly unpredictable absent a clear

Art Unit: 1614

understanding of the structural and biochemical basis of the agent. The instant specification sets forth no such understanding nor any criteria for extrapolating beyond the administration of the compound to inhibit various side effects. Even for the data presented, no direction is provided to prevent specific causes of a side effect selected from edema, heart enlargement and anemia. Absent reasonable *a priori* expectations of success, one skilled in the art would have to test extensively many conditions that may lead to a side effect selected from edema, heart enlargement and anemia to discover which cause is prevented. Since each prospective embodiment, as well as future embodiments as the art progresses, would have to be empirically tested, undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as it is claimed in its current scope. The specification provides inadequate guidance to do otherwise.

Claim 16 is not allowed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meguro et al. (4,687,777), Hindley (5,002,953), France Patent (2,832,064), Momose et al. (6,251,926) and Yamasaki et al. (6,166,219) in view of Khaled (5,977,073) or Giordano et al. (6,660,293).

Meguro et al. teach pioglitazone as a well-known anti-diabetic agent.

Hindley teaches rosiglitazone as a well-known anti-diabetic agent.

The French Patent 2,832,064 teaches CS-011 as a well-known anti-diabetic agent.

Momose et al. teach TAK-559 as a well-known anti-diabetic agent.

Yamasaki et al. teach FK-614 as a well-known anti-diabetic agent.

The instant invention differs from the cited references in that the cited references do not teach the addition of vitamin B<sub>1</sub>. However, the secondary references, either one of them, Khaled or Giordano et al., teaches compositions and methods comprising vitamin B<sub>1</sub> are used to treat diabetes.


Clearly, one skilled in the art would have assumed the combination of two individual agents well-known to treat diabetes into a single composition would give an additive effect in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 9-15 are not allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin E. Weddington whose telephone number is (571)272-0587. The examiner can normally be reached on 12:30 pm-9:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571)272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Kevin E. Weddington  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1614

Application/Control Number: 10/572,557

Page 12

Art Unit: 1614

K. Weddington

June 8, 2007